

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

* * *

DAHLIA DWEDAR,
Plaintiff,
v.
STATE OF NEVADA EX REL. BOARD
OF REGENTS OF THE NEVADA
SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION, ON
BEHALF OF THE UNIVERSITY OF
NEVADA, RENO
Defendant.

Case No. 3:24-cv-00583-MMD-CLB

**ORDER DENYING WITH LEAVE TO
REFILE DISCOVERY PLAN AND
SCHEDULING ORDER**

(ECF Nos. 22; 23)

Before the Court is the parties' joint discovery plan and scheduling order, which is contained with the parties' Joint Case Management Report. (ECF Nos. 22 at 7-8; 23 at 7-8.) The Court has reviewed the proposed discovery plan and scheduling order and finds that it fails to provide a sufficient basis for a longer period of discovery than contemplated by the Local Rules.

Pursuant to Local Rule (“LR”) 26-1(a),

If longer deadlines are proposed [in a discovery plan and scheduling order], the plan must state on its face "SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED." Plans requesting special scheduling review must include, in addition to the information required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f) and LR 26-1(b), a statement of the reasons why longer or different time periods should apply to the case

The proposed discovery plan and scheduling order states 180 days for discovery is not sufficient because “Plaintiff’s counsel has a trial in June and that the parties are just now beginning the active litigation process.” (ECF Nos. 22 at 6; 23 at 6.) No information is provided as to the length of the June trial and neither reason provided is sufficient to support a longer discovery period. All cases filed in the federal court are at the beginning of the “active litigation process” when the discovery period begins, and the Local Rules provide for a default period of 180 days to complete discovery in all such cases. See LR 26-1. Considering that there are only three claims in this case and a limited number of

1 parties, the Court does not find good cause to permit an additional 90 days for discovery
2 without any further explanation than that provided by the parties.

3 Accordingly, the proposed discovery plan and scheduling order contained in the
4 parties' Joint Case Management Report, (ECF Nos. 22; 23), is rejected and **DENIED with**
5 **leave to refile**. The parties shall have until **May 27, 2025**, to re-submit a discovery plan
6 and scheduling order that complies with LR 26-1.

7 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

8 **DATED:** May 13, 2025

9
10 
11 **UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28